



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

CH

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/885,290	06/19/2001	Thomas Markson	55218-0519	3062

45657 7590 11/01/2006

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER, LLP
AND SUN MICROSYSTEMS, INC.
2055 GATEWAY PLACE
SUITE 550
SAN JOSE, CA 95110-1089

EXAMINER

TODD, GREGORY G

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2157

DATE MAILED: 11/01/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/885,290	MARKSON ET AL.
	Examiner Gregory G. Todd	Art Unit 2157

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 August 2006.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,2,7,8,10-12,15,40-43,45-47,49-53,55-57 and 59-68 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1,2,7,8,10-12,15,40-43,45-47,49-53,55-57 and 59-68 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
 * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____
---	---

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This office action is in response to applicant's amendment filed, 01 August 2006, of application filed, with the above serial number, on 19 June 2001 in which claims 1-2, 7-8, 10-11, 15, 40-43, 45-46, 49-53, 55-56, and 59 have been amended, claims 3-6, 9, 13-14, 16-39, 44, 48, 54, and 58 have been cancelled, and claims 60-68 have been added. Claims 1-2, 7-8, 10-12, 15, 40-43, 45-47, 49-53, 55-57, and 59-68 are therefore pending in the application.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 7 is objected to because of the following informalities: The "one or storage units" is suggested to be replaced with "one or more storage units". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 7 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The term "logical unit numbers (LUNs)" is inconsistent with "logical units (LUNs)" in the claims and as such, the term LUNs is indefinite.

Claims 62 and 65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claim limitation "wherein the first host processor does not determine that the second logical unit wherein" appears incomplete and not definite.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1-2, 7-8, 10, 15, 40-43, 45, 49-53, 55, and 59-68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Blumenau et al (hereinafter "Blumenau", 6,421,711).

As per Claim 1, Blumenau teaches a computer-implemented method of allocating storage to a host processor comprising:

a control processor receiving a request to allocate storage to the host processor (at least col. 31, lines 27-39; col. 33, lines 29-66; host requesting allocation of a volume); and

the control processor associating one or more logical units from among one or more storage units to the host processor by (at least col. 31, lines 9-51; col. 33 line 53 - col. 34 line 50; allocated and assigning LUN):

the control processor configuring a gateway device to map the one or more logical units to the host processor (at least col. 32 line 13 - col. 33 line 17; allocated and assigning LUN, the control processor being a part of the gateway device/gatekeeper and configuring itself);

the control processor configuring the one or more storage units to give the host processor access to the one or more logical units (at least col. 31, lines 9-51; col. 33 line 53 - col. 34 line 39; host or host controller having ability to access volumes); and

wherein the host processor does not determine which one or more logical units are associated with the host processor (at least col. 32, lines 13-43; host obtaining LUNs associated with it).

As per Claim 2. A method as recited in claim 1, wherein:

the control processor configuring the gateway device and the control processor configuring the one or more storage units are performed by the control processor without modification to an operating system of the host processor (at least col. 31, lines 9-51; col. 33 line 53 - col. 34 line 50);

the gateway device is included in a virtual storage layer (at least col. 32 line 13 - col. 33 line 17; storage subsystem volume / LUN);

the host processor and the one or more storage units are included in a virtual server farm (at least col. 21 line 16 - col. 22 line 63; col. 7, lines 51-65; collection of servers);

the control processor is coupled through one or more storage networks to a plurality of storage gateways that includes the gateway device (at least col. 31, lines 9-51; col. 9, lines 18-43; Fig. 1-4; storage volumes); and

the plurality of storage gateways are coupled through the storage networks to the one or more storage units (at least col. 31, lines 9-51; col. 9, lines 18-43; Fig. 1-4).

As per Claim 7. A method as recited in claim 1, further comprising:

the control processor causing the storage of first information that associates processors to logical units (at least col. 21 line 16 - col. 22 line 21; host to LUN to logical volume);

the control processor causing the storage of second information that associates logical units to storage units (at least col. 21 line 16 - col. 22 line 21; host to LUN to logical volume); and

the control processor associating the one or more logical units from among the one or more storage units to the host processor further comprises the control processor mapping the one or more logical units from among the one or more storage units to a boot port of the host processor by reconfiguring the gateway device to logically couple the one or more logical units to the boot port based on the stored first information and

the stored second information (at least col. 32 line 13 - col. 33 line 17; boot from storage subsystem volume);

the control processor identifying one or more logical unit numbers (LUNs) corresponding to the one or more logical units (at least col. 32 line 13 - col. 34 line 59; col. 9, lines 44-57; col. 21, lines 16-55);

control processor instructing the gateway device to map the identified LUNs to the small computer system interface (SCSI) port zero of the host processor based on a unique processor identifier (at least col. 32 line 13 - col. 34 line 59; col. 9, lines 44-57); and

the control processor instructing the one or more storage units to give the host processor having the unique host identifier access to the identified LUNs (at least col. 31, lines 9-51).

As per Claim 8. A method as recited in claim 1, wherein the request to allocate storage to the host processor is a first request to allocate storage to the host processor, and the method further comprises:

based on the first request, the control processor generating a second request to allocate storage to the host processor (at least col. 11, lines 3-30; Fig. 1; col. 31, lines 9-61; col. 29 line 58 - col. 30 line 12);

wherein the control processor is communicatively coupled to a control database (at least col. 11, lines 3-30; Fig. 1; col. 31, lines 9-61; col. 29 line 58 - col. 30 line 12; gatekeeper with configuration database);

wherein the second request is directed from the control processor to a storage manager (at least col. 11, lines 3-30; Fig. 1; col. 31, lines 9-61; col. 29 line 58 - col. 30 line 12; gatekeeper with configuration database);

wherein the storage manager is communicatively coupled to the control processor, the control database, and a storage network that includes the gateway device (at least col. 11, lines 3-30; Fig. 1; col. 31, lines 9-61; col. 29 line 58 - col. 30 line 12; gatekeeper with configuration database); and

the method further comprises the control processor causing the storage manager to issue instructions to the one or more storage units to give the host processor access to the one or more logical units (at least col. 31, lines 9-51)

As per Claim 10. A method as recited in claim 1, wherein the request to allocate storage specifies a first amount of storage (eg. a single logical volume; see col. 1, lines 40-58), and wherein the control processor associating the one or more logical units further comprises:

the control processor identifying the one or more logical units (LUNs) of the one or more storage units that, when combined, have a second amount of storage that is at least as great as the first amount of storage specified in the request (at least col. 32 line 13 - col. 34 line 59; col. 9, lines 44-57).

As per Claim 15. A method as recited in claim 1, wherein:

the one or more logical units associated with the host processor include at least a first logical unit from a first volume of a first storage unit of the one or more storage units and at least a second logical unit from a second volume of a second storage unit of the one or more storage units (at least Fig. 19; col. 21, lines 16-67);

the request to allocate storage specifies a parameter selected from the group consisting of an amount of storage to be allocated and a type of storage to be allocated (at least col. 31 line 9 - col. 32 line 12; col. 6 line 64 - col. 7 line 65; col. 9, lines 44-57; col. 32, lines 58-67; col. 34, lines 2-17).

the control processor is separate from the gateway device, the host processor, and the one or more storage units (at least col. 31, lines 9-51; col. 9, lines 18-43; Fig. 1-4); and

the gateway device is separate from the control processor, the host processor, and the one or more storage units (at least col. 31, lines 9-51; col. 9, lines 18-43; Fig. 1-4).

As per Claim 60. A method as recited in Claim 1, wherein the host processor does not know which one or more logical units are associated with the host processor (at least col. 11 line 57 – col. 12 line 31; restrict volumes seen (“known”) by any one host).

As per Claim 61. A method as recited in Claim 1, wherein:

the one or more logical units are associated with one or more logical unit numbers (LUNs) (at least col. 32 line 13 - col. 34 line 59; col. 9, lines 44-57; col. 21, lines 16-55); and

the host processor does not know the one or more LUNs for the one or more logical units that are associated with the host processor (at least col. 11 line 57 – col. 12 line 31; restrict volumes seen by any one host).

As per Claim 62. A method as recited in Claim 1, wherein:

the host processor is a first host processor (at least Fig. 1-3);

the one or more logical units include a first logical unit and a second logical unit (at least Fig. 1-3);

the one or more storage units include a first storage unit and a second storage unit (at least Fig. 1-3);

the first logical unit is associated with the first storage unit (at least Fig. 1-3);

the second logical unit is associated with the second storage unit (at least Fig. 1-3);

the control processor associates the first logical unit and the second logical unit to the first host processor at a first time (at least col. 31, lines 9-51; col. 33 line 53 - col. 34 line 50; allocated and assigning LUN); and

the method further comprises:

at a second time that is after the first time, the control processor associating the second logical unit with a second host processor by:

the control processor configuring the gateway device to map the second logical unit to the second host processor instead of the first host processor (at least col. 32 line 13 - col. 33 line 17; allocated and assigning LUN, the control processor being a part of the gateway device/gatekeeper and configuring itself); the control processor configuring the second storage unit to give the second host processor access to the second logical unit instead of the first host processor (at least col. 31, lines 9-51; col. 33 line 53 - col. 34 line 39; host or host controller having ability to access volumes);

wherein the second host processor does not determine that the second logical unit is associated with the second host processor (at least col. 32, lines 13-43; host obtaining LUNs associated with it);

wherein the first logical unit remains associated with the first host processor (at least Fig. 1-3);

at a third time that is after the second time, the control processor associating the second logical unit with the first host processor by:

the control processor configuring the gateway device to map the second logical unit to the first host processor instead of the second host processor (at least col. 32 line 13 - col. 33 line 17; allocated and assigning LUN, the control processor being a part of the gateway device/gatekeeper and configuring itself);

the control processor configuring the second storage unit to give the fist host processor access to the second logical unit instead of the second host processor (at

least col. 31, lines 9-51; col. 33 line 53 - col. 34 line 39; host or host controller having ability to access volumes);

wherein the first host processor does not determine that the second logical unit is associated with the first host processor (at least col. 32, lines 13-43; host obtaining LUNs associated with it); and

wherein the first logical unit remains associated with the first host processor (at least Fig. 1-3).

Claims 40-43, 45, 49-53, 55, 59, and 63-68 do not substantially add or define any additional limitations over claims 1, 2, 7-8, 10, 15, and 60-62 and therefore are rejected for similar reasons.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 11-12, 46-47, and 56-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blumenau in view of Ofer et al (hereinafter "Ofer", 6,260,109).

As per Claim 11. A method as recited in claim 1, wherein the request is a first request, and the control processor associating the one or more logical units further comprises:

the control processor issuing a second request to allocate one or more volumes on one of the one or more storage units (at least col. 31, lines 27-39; col. 33 line 29 - col. 34 line 50);

the control processor causing the volume to be configured for use with the host processor (at least col. 31, lines 9-51);

the control processor issuing first instructions to the one or more storage units to bind the host processor to the volume by giving the host processor access to the volume (at least col. 33 line 29 - col. 34 line 50);

the control processor issuing second instructions to the gateway device to bind the volume to the host processor (at least col. 33 line 29 - col. 34 line 50; eg. gatekeeper).

Blumenau fails to explicitly teach the volume being concatenated. However, the use and advantages for using such concatenation is well known to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made as evidenced by the teachings of Ofer (at least Abstract). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Ofer's use of concatenation into Blumenau's system as this would enhance Blumenau's RAID arrays and subsequently allocated logical volumes to be combined together as this is well known in the art in expanding storage.

As per Claim 12. A method as recited in claim 11, further comprising:

the control processor determining that the second instructions have failed to bind the concatenated volume to the host processor (at least col. 33 line 29 - col. 34 line 50);

the control processor issuing third instructions to the one or more storage units to un-bind the host processor from the concatenated volume (at least col. 33 line 29 - col. 34 line 50; removing and deallocating);

the control processor determining that the first instructions have failed to bind the host processor to the volume (at least col. 33 line 29 - col. 34 line 50); and

the control processor issuing fourth instructions to the one or more storage units to break the volume (at least col. 33 line 29 - col. 34 line 50).

Claims 46, 47 and 56-57 do not substantially add or define any additional limitations over claims 11-12 and therefore are rejected for similar reasons.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed 01 August 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argue Blumenau does not teach the host processor not determining which logical units are associated with it.

In response, it is noted Applicant specified that the "control processor" does not determine which logical units are associated with the host processor, see pp. 23 line 3. However, it will be assumed Applicant is arguing what the claim limitation specifies. Applicant offers support in the specification for such limitation with reference to Fig. 3,

wherein the host can obtain storage... "without determining or knowing" the sub-unit of a storage unit. While the term determine might encompass determining from knowledge already given to an object, knowing cannot encompass determining and from Applicant's excerpt, here, it is clear that knowing is different than determining. So, while, in this case, Blumenau does teach the host *knowing* LUNs it is able to access (see col. 32, lines 13-31), Blumenau's host does not, in fact, *determine* the LUNs it can access. Thus, Blumenau does "teach" the negative limitation of the claims. With respect to claim 60 and Blumenau knowing LUNs it is able to access, Blumenau does teach it is possible to restrict those volumes seen ("known") by any one host (at least col. 11 line 57 – col. 12 line 31) and thus not 'knowing' a logical unit associated with the host processor.

Applicants further argue Blumenau fails to teach amended features of claim 10, including the one or more logical units (LUNs) of the one or more storage units that, when combined, have a second amount of storage that is at least as great as the first amount of storage. However, the second amount of storage being *equal* to the first amount is within the wording of "at least as great as the first amount" in the claim limitation, as amended, thus Blumenau teaches the claim limitation as amended. Blumenau further teaches specifying a first amount of storage as the host requests the allocation of a volume (see col. 31 line 27 – col. 32 line 43), and thus an amount of storage being a volume, in this case.

Applicants further argue Blumenau in view of Ofer fails to teach a concatenated volume as in claim 11. However, Ofer teaches a larger logical volume being produced from concatenations, and thus teaches a volume being concatenated.

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Newly cited Pothapragada et al, in addition to previously cited Sheets et al, Blickenstaff et al, Aziz et al, Denning et al, Nguyen et al, Nolan et al ('526, '278), Popelka et al, Hickman et al, Tamer et al, and Blumenau '442 are cited for disclosing pertinent information related to the claimed invention. Applicants are requested to consider the prior art reference for relevant teachings when responding to this office action.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gregory G. Todd whose telephone number is (571)272-4011. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9:00am-6:00pm w/ first Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571)272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Gregory Todd

Patent Examiner

Technology Center 2100


ARIO ETIENNE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100